arXiv:1703.03165v1 [stat.ME] 9 Mar 2017

Perturbation Bootstrap in Adaptive Lasso

Debraj Das[1], Karl Gregory[2] and S. N. Lahiri[1]

[1] North Carolina State University USA
ddas3@ncsu.edu, snlahiri@ncsu.edu
[2] University of Mannheim, Germany
kgregory@mail.uni-mannheim.de

Abstract. The Adaptive LASSO (ALASSO) was proposed by Zou [*J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* ***101*** *(2006) 1418-1429*] as a modification of the LASSO for the purpose of simultaneous variable selection and estimation of the parameters in a linear regression model. Zou (2006) established that the ALASSO estimator is variable-selection consistent as well as asymptotically Normal in the indices corresponding to the nonzero regression coefficients in certain fixed-dimensional settings. In an influential paper, Minnier, Tian and Cai [*J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* ***106*** *(2011) 1371-1382*] proposed a perturbation bootstrap method and established its distributional consistency for the ALASSO estimator in the fixed-dimensional setting. In this paper, however, we show that this (naive) perturbation bootstrap fails to achieve second order correctness in approximating the distribution of the ALASSO estimator. We propose a modification to the perturbation bootstrap objective function and show that a suitably studentized version of our modified perturbation bootstrap ALASSO estimator achieves second-order correctness even when the dimension of the model is allowed to grow to infinity with the sample size. As a consequence, inferences based on the modified perturbation bootstrap will be more accurate than the inferences based on the oracle Normal approximation. We give simulation studies demonstrating good finite-sample properties of our modified perturbation bootstrap method as well as an illustration of our method on a real data set.

Keywords: ALASSO, Naive Perturbation Bootstrap, Modified Perturbation Bootstrap, Second order correctness, Oracle Distribution

Table of Contents

Perturbation Bootstrap in Adaptive Lasso 1
Debraj Das, Karl Gregory and S. N. Lahiri
1 Introduction 2
2 The modified perturbation bootstrap for the ALASSO 6
3 Main results for the modified perturbation bootstrap 7
3.1 Results for $p \leq n$. 9
3.2 Results for $p > n$. 9
4 Impossibility of Second-order correctness of the naive perturbation bootstrap 10
4.1 Motivation for the modified perturbation bootstrap 12
5 Simulation results 13
6 Data analysis 16
7 Appendix 17
7.1 Additional Notations and Assumptions 17
7.2 Proofs 22

1 Introduction

Consider the multiple linear regression model

$$y_i = \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1.1}$$

where $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are responses, $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ are independent and identically distributed (iid) random variables, $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n$ are known non-random design vectors, and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p)$ is the p-dimensional vector of regression parameters. When the dimension p is large, it is common to approach regression model (1.1) with the assumption that the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is sparse, that is that the set $\mathcal{A} = \{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}$ has cardinality $p_0 = |\mathcal{A}|$ much smaller than p, meaning that only a few of the covariates are "active". The LASSO estimator introduced by Tibshirani (1996) is well suited to the sparse setting because of its property that it sets some regression coefficients exactly equal to 0. One disadvantage of the LASSO, however, is that it produces non-trivial asymptotic bias for the non-zero regression parameters, primarily because it shrinks all estimators toward zero [cf. Knight and Fu (2000)].

Building on the LASSO, Zou (2006) proposed the adaptive LASSO [hereafter referred to as ALASSO] estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the regression problem (1.1) as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{t}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{t})^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\tilde{\beta}_{j,n}|^{-\gamma} |t_j| \right], \tag{1.2}$$

where $\tilde{\beta}_{j,n}$ is the jth component of a root-n-consistent estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, such as the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator when $p \leq n$ or the LASSO or ridge

regression estimator when $p > n$, $\lambda_n > 0$ is the penalty parameter, and $\gamma > 0$ is a constant governing the influence of the preliminary estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ on the ALASSO fit. Zou (2006) showed in the fixed-p setting that under some regularity conditions and with the right choice of λ_n, the ALASSO estimator enjoys the so-called oracle property [cf. Fan and Li (2001)]; that is, it is variable-selection consistent and it estimates the non-zero regression parameters with the same precision as the OLS estimator which one would compute if the set of active covariates were known.

In an important recent work, Minnier, Tian and Cai (2011) introduced the perturbation bootstrap in the ALASSO setup. To state their main results, let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N} = (\beta_{1,n}^{*N}, \ldots, \beta_{p,n}^{*N})'$ be the naive perturbation bootstrap ALASSO estimator prescribed by Minnier, Tian and Cai (2011) and define $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{j,n} \neq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_n^{*N} = \{j : \beta_{j,n}^{*N} \neq 0\}$. These authors showed that under some regularity conditions and with p fixed as $n \to \infty$

$$\mathbf{P}_*(\mathcal{A}_n^{*N} = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_n) \to 1 \text{ and } \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N(1)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{(1)})|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \asymp_d \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$, $\boldsymbol{z}^{(1)}$ denotes the sub-vector of $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathcal{R}^p$ corresponding to the co-ordinates in $\mathcal{A} = \{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}$, "$\asymp_d$" denotes asymptotic equivalence in distribution, and $\mathbf{P}_*$ denotes bootstrap probability conditional on the data. Thus Minnier, Tian and Cai (2011) [hereafter referred to as MTC(11)] showed that, in the fixed-p setting and conditionally on the data, the naive perturbation bootstrap version of the ALASSO estimator is variable-selection consistent in the sense that it recovers the support of the ALASSO estimator with probability tending to one and that its distribution conditional on the data converges at the same time to that of the ALASSO estimator for the non-zero regression parameters. But the accuracy of inference for non-zero regression parameters relies on the rate of convergence of the bootstrap distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N(1)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{(1)})|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ to the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)})$ after proper studentization. Furthermore, Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013) showed that the convergence of the ALASSO estimators of the nonzero regression coefficients to their oracle Normal distribution is quite slow, owing to the bias induced by the penalty term in (1.2). Thus, it would be important for the accuracy of inference if second-order correctness can be achieved in approximating the distribution of the ALASSO estimator by the perturbation bootstrap. Second-order correctness implies that the distributional approximation has a uniform error rate of $o_p(n^{-1/2})$. We show in this paper, however, that the distribution of the naive perturbation bootstrap version of the ALASSO estimator, as defined by MTC(11), cannot be second order correct even in fixed dimension. For more details, see Section 4.

We introduce a modified perturbation bootstrap for the ALASSO estimator for which second order correctness does hold, even when the number of regression parameters $p = p_n$ is allowed to increase with the sample size n. We also show in Proposition 2.1 that the modified perturbation bootstrap version of the ALASSO estimator (defined in Section 2) can be computed by minimizing simple

criterion functions. This makes our bootstrap procedure computationally simple and inexpensive.

In this paper, we consider some pivotal quantities based on ALASSO estimators and establish that the modified perturbation bootstrap estimates the distribution of these pivotal quantities up to second order, i.e. with an error that is of much smaller magnitude than what we would obtain by using the Normal approximation under the knowledge of the true active set of covariates. We will refer to the Normal approximation which uses knowledge of the true set of active covariates as the oracle Normal approximation. Our main results show that the modified perturbation bootstrap method enables, for example, the construction of confidence intervals for the nonzero regression coefficients with smaller coverage error than those based on the oracle Normal approximation.

More precisely, we consider pivots which are studentizations of the quantities

$$\sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{D}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{D}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ is a $q \times p$ matrix (q fixed) producing q linear combinations of interest of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and where $\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n$ is a bias correction term which we will define later. We find that in the $p \leq n$ case, the modified perturbation bootstrap can estimate the distribution of the first pivot with an error of order $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ (see Theorem 3.1). This is much smaller than the error of the oracle Normal approximation, which was shown in Theorem 3.1 of Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013) to be of the order $O_p(n^{-1/2}+||\boldsymbol{b}_n||+c_n)$, where $\boldsymbol{b}_n$ is the bias targeted by $\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n$ and $c_n > 0$ is determined by the initial estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ and the tuning parameters λ_n and γ; both $||\boldsymbol{b}_n||$ and c_n are typically greater in magnitude than $n^{-1/2}$ and hence determine the rate of the oracle Normal approximation. We also discover that the bias correction in the second pivot improves the error rate so that the modified perturbation bootstrap estimator achieves the rate $O_p(n^{-1})$ (see Theorem 3.2), which is a significant improvement over the best possible rate of oracle Normal approximation, namely $O(n^{-1/2})$. In the $p > n$ case, we find that the modified perturbation bootstrap estimates the distributions of studentized versions of both the bias-corrected and un-bias-corrected pivots with the rate $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ (see Theorem 3.3), establishing the second-order correctness of our modified perturbation bootstrap in the high-dimensional setting.

We show that the naive perturbation bootstrap of MTC(11) is not second-order correct (see Theorem 4.1) by investigating the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) condition [cf. Boyd and Lieven (2004)] corresponding to their minimization problem. It is shown that second order correctness is not attainable by the naive version of the perturbation bootstrap, primarily due to lack of proper centering of the naive bootstrapped ALASSO criterion function. We derive the form of the centering constant by analyzing the corresponding approximation errors using the theory of Edgeworth expansion. To accommodate the centering correction, we modify the perturbation bootstrap criterion function for the ALASSO; see

Section 2 for details. In addition, we also find out that it is beneficial, from both theoretical and computational perspectives, to modify the perturbation bootstrap version of the initial estimators in a similar way. To prove second order correctness of the modified perturbation bootstrap ALASSO, the key steps are to find an Edgeworth expansion of the bootstrap pivotal quantities based on the modified criterion function and to compare it with the Edgeworth expansion of the sample pivots. We want to mention that in our setting, the dimension p of the regression parameter vector can grow polynomially in the sample size n at a rate depending on the number of finite moments of the error distribution. Extension to the case in which p grows exponentially with n would be possible under some strong assumptions, e.g. under finiteness of the moment generating function of the regression errors.

We conclude this section with a brief literature review. The perturbation bootstrap was introduced by Jin, Ying, and Wei (2001) as a resampling procedure where the objective function has a U-process structure. Work on the perturbation bootstrap in the linear regression setup is limited. Some work has been carried out by Chatterjee and Bose (2005), MTC(11), Zhou, Song and Thompson (2012), and Das and Lahiri (2016). An analogous bootstrap procedure, called multiplier bootstrap, emerged recently as an effective procedure for approximating the underlying sampling distribution. For details on multiplier bootstrap procedure see Bücher and Dette (2013), Chernozhukov et al. (2013, 2014, 2016), Bücher and Kojadinovic (2016a, 2016b) and references therein. As a variable selection procedure, Tibshirani (1996) introduced the LASSO. Zou (2006) proposed the ALASSO as an improvement over the LASSO. For the ALASSO and related popular penalized estimation and variable selection procedures, the residual bootstrap has been investigated by Knight and Fu (2000), Hall, Lee and Park (2009), Chatterjee and Lahiri (2010, 2011, 2013), Wang and Song (2011), MTC(11), Van De Geer et al. (2014), and Camponovo (2015), among others.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The modified perturbation bootstrap for the ALASSO is introduced and discussed in Section 2. Main results concerning the estimation properties of the studentized modified perturbation bootstrap pivotal quantities are given in Section 3. Negative results on the naive perturbation bootstrap approximation proposed by MTC(11) are discussed and intuition and explanations behind the modification of the modified perturbation bootstrap are given in Section 4. Section 5 presents simulation results exploring the finite-sample performance of the modified perturbation bootstrap in comparison with other methods for constructing confidence intervals based on ALASSO estimators and Section 6 gives an illustration on real data. Regularity conditions and the proofs are provided in Section 7. Further simulation results are relegated to the Supplementary Material.

2 The modified perturbation bootstrap for the ALASSO

Suppose, $G_1^*, \ldots, G_n^*$ be n independent copies of a non-degenerate random variable $G^* \in [0, \infty)$ having expectation μ_{G^*}. These quantities will serve as perturbation quantities. The modified perturbation bootstrap in ALASSO involves careful construction of the penalized objective function. We need ALASSO estimated values $\hat{y}_i = \boldsymbol{x}_i' \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ besides the observed values y_i, $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ to define the penalized objective function. The modified penalized objective function needs to incorporate the sum of two perturbed least square objective functions, one involving y_i, $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ and other with $\hat{y}_i$, $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, see definition 2.1. Similar modification is also needed in defining the bootstrap versions of the initial estimators, see definition 2.2. The motivation behind this construction is detailed in Section 4, where we also point out why the naive perturbation bootstrap formulation of MTC(11) fails drastically.

Formally, The modified perturbation bootstrap version $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^*$ of the ALASSO estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ is defined as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^{*} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{t}^*} \Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t}^*)^2 (G_i^* - \mu_{G^*}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{y}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t}^*)^2 (2\mu_{G^*} - G_i^*) + \mu_{G^*} \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\tilde{\beta}_{jn}^*|^{-\gamma} |t_j^*| \Bigg], \tag{2.1}$$

where $\tilde{\beta}_{jn}^*$ is the jth component of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^*$, the modified perturbation bootstrap version of the initial estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$. We construct $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{*} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{t}^*} \Bigg[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t}^*)^2 (G_i^* - \mu_{G^*}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{y}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t}^*)^2 (2\mu_{G^*} - G_i^*) + \mu_{G^*} \tilde{\lambda}_n \sum_{j=1}^{p} |t_j^*|^l \Bigg], \tag{2.2}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_n = 0$ when $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ is taken as the OLS, when $p \leq n$, and $l = 1$ or 2 according as the initial estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ is taken as the LASSO or Ridge estimator, when $p > n$. Note that $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ may be different from λ_n.

We point out that the modified perturbation bootstrapped estimators can be computed using existing algorithms. Define, $\boldsymbol{L}_1(\boldsymbol{t}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t})^2 (G_i^* - \mu_{G^*}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{y}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t})^2 (2\mu_{G^*} - G_i^*) + \mu_{G^*} \tilde{\lambda}_n \sum_{j=1}^{p} c_j |t_j|^l$ for some non-negative constants c_j, $j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$, where $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \cdots, t_n)'$. Now assume, $z_i = \hat{y}_i + \hat{\epsilon}_i \mu_{G^*}^{-1} (G_i^* - \mu_{G^*})$, where $\hat{\epsilon}_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\boldsymbol{L}_2(\boldsymbol{t}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(z_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{t} \right)^2 + \tilde{\lambda}_n \sum_{j=1}^{p} c_j |t_j|^l$. Then we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1. $\arg\min_{\boldsymbol{t}} \boldsymbol{L}_1(\boldsymbol{t}) = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{t}} \boldsymbol{L}_2(\boldsymbol{t})$.

This proposition allows us to compute $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^*$ as well as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^*$ by minimizing standard objective functions on some pseudo-values. Note that the modified perturbation bootstrapped ALASSO estimator as well as the initial estimators can be obtained by properly perturbing the ALASSO residuals only in the decomposition $y_i = \hat{y}_i + \hat{\epsilon}_i$, $i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$.

3 Main results for the modified perturbation bootstrap

We here present the minimal notation for stating our main results. Assumptions (A.1)–(A.7), to which we refer in the statements of our results, are detailed in Section 7.

From now on we denote the true parameter vector as $\boldsymbol{\beta}_n = (\beta_{1,n}, \ldots, \beta_{p,n})'$, where the subscript n emphasizes that the dimension $p := p_n$ may grow with the sample size n. From $\boldsymbol{\beta}_n$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^*$ define $\mathcal{A}_n = \{j : \beta_{j,n} \neq 0\}$, $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{j,n} \neq 0\}$, and $\mathcal{A}_n^* = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{j,n}^* \neq 0\}$ and let $p_0 := p_{0,n} = |\mathcal{A}_n|$. We will suppose, without loss of generality, that $\mathcal{A}_n = \{1, \ldots, p_0\}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{C}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{x}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i'$ and partition it according to $\mathcal{A}_n = \{1, \ldots, p_0\}$ as

$$\boldsymbol{C}_n = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n} & \boldsymbol{C}_{12,n} \\ \boldsymbol{C}_{21,n} & \boldsymbol{C}_{22,n} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}$ is of dimension $p_0 \times p_0$. Define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i = \boldsymbol{C}_n^{-1} \boldsymbol{x}_i$ and partition $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ as $\boldsymbol{x}_i = (\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)'}, \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(2)'})'$, where $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)}$ is a $p_0 \times 1$ vector. Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{x}_i$.

Now define $\boldsymbol{T}_n = \sqrt{n} \boldsymbol{D}_n (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n)$ and the corresponding modified pertrubation bootstrap version $\boldsymbol{T}_n^* = \sqrt{n} \boldsymbol{D}_n (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^* - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)$, where $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ is a known $q \times p$ matrix with $\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{D}_n \boldsymbol{D}_n') = O(1)$ and q is not dependent on n. Let $\boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)}$ contain the first p_0 columns of $\boldsymbol{D}_n$. Define also the matrices $\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}_{11,n}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}$ according to $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n$ such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}_{11,n}$ is the $|\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n| \times |\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n|$ sub-matrix of $\boldsymbol{C}_n$ with rows and columns in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}$ is the $q \times |\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n|$ sub-matrix of $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ with columns in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(1)} = (x_{i,j}, j \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}_n)'$. Let $sgn(x) = -1, 0, 1$ according as $x < 0$, $x = 0$, $x > 0$, respectively. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_q$ the collection of convex sets of $\mathcal{R}^q$.

Our results will concern convergence in distribution of some studentizations of $\mathbf{T}_n^*$ to the distributions of corresponding studentizations of $\mathbf{T}_n$. Define the studentized or pivot quantities

$$\mathbf{R}_n = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_n^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_n \text{ for } p \leq n \\ \hat{\sigma}_n^{-1} \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_n \text{ for } p > n \end{cases} \qquad \mathbf{R}_n^* = \begin{cases} \hat{\sigma}_n^{*-1} \hat{\sigma}_n \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_n^* \text{ for } p \leq n \\ \hat{\sigma}_n^{*-1} \hat{\sigma}_n \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_n^* \text{ for } p > n \end{cases}$$

$$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n = \check{\sigma}_n^{-1} \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} [\mathbf{T}_n + \check{\mathbf{b}}_n] \qquad \check{\mathbf{R}}_n^* = \check{\sigma}_n^{*-1} \check{\sigma}_n \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} [\mathbf{T}_n^* + \check{\mathbf{b}}_n^*],$$

where $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ and $\check{\mathbf{R}}^*_n$ involve the bias-corrections $\check{\mathbf{b}}_n$ and $\check{\mathbf{b}}^*_n$. In the above:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}+\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}\big)\big(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}+\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}\big)', \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)\prime},$$
$$\check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big(\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}+\check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}\big)\big(\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}+\check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}\big)', \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)\prime},$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{\boldsymbol{i}}^{(0)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}_{11,n}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}_{11,n}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i$, with

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i = \Big(\frac{\lambda_n}{2n}\tilde{x}_{i,j}\frac{\gamma}{|\hat{\beta}_{j,n}|^{\gamma+1}}\mathrm{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_{j,n})\Big)_{j\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n},$$

and $\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}\hat{\epsilon}_i$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}\hat{\epsilon}_i$, where $\hat{\epsilon}_i = y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i'\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ for $i = 1,\ldots,n$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_n^2 &= n^{-1}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\Big(y_i - \sum_{j=1}^p x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_{j,n}\Big)^2\\
\check{\sigma}_n^2 &= n^{-1}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\Big(y_i - \sum_{j\in\hat{A}_n} x_{ij}\tilde{\beta}_{j,n}\Big)^2\\
\hat{\sigma}_n^{*2} &= n^{-1}\mu_{G^*}^{-2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\Big(y_i - \sum_{j=1}^p x_{ij}\hat{\beta}^*_{j,n}\Big)^2(G_i^*-\mu_{G^*})^2\\
\check{\sigma}_n^{*2} &= n^{-1}\mu_{G^*}^{-2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\Big(y_i - \sum_{j\in\hat{A}^*_n} x_{ij}\tilde{\beta}^*_{j,n}\Big)^2(G_i^*-\mu_{G^*})^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and lastly

$$\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n = \hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}_{11,n}^{-1}\hat{s}_n^{(1)}\frac{\lambda_n}{2\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\boldsymbol{b}}^*_n = \hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{*(1)}\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}_{11,n}^{*-1}\hat{s}_n^{*(1)}\frac{\lambda_n}{2\sqrt{n}},$$

where $\hat{s}_n^{(1)}$ and $\hat{s}_n^{*(1)}$ are the $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n\times 1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n\times 1$ vectors with jth entry equal to $\mathrm{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_{jn})|\tilde{\beta}_{jn}|^\gamma$, $j\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(\hat{\beta}^*_{jn})|\tilde{\beta}^*_{jn}|^\gamma$, $j\in\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n$, respectively. The matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}^*_{11,n}$ is the $|\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n|\times|\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n|$ sub-matrix of $\boldsymbol{C}_n$ with rows and columns in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{*(1)}$ is the $q\times|\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n|$ sub-matrix of $\boldsymbol{D}_n$ with columns in $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*_n$.

We are motivated to look at these studentized or pivot quantities by the fact that studentization improves the rate of convergence of bootstrap estimators in many settings [cf. Hall (1992)].

Remark 1. Note that the matrices $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$, $\check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$, $\check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$ used in defining the bootstrap pivots do not depend on $G_1^*,\ldots,G_n^*$. Hence it is not required to compute the negative square roots of these matrices for each Monte Carlo bootstrap iteration; these must only be computed once. This is a notable feature of our modified perturbation bootstrap method from the perspective of computational complexity.

3.1 Results for $p \leq n$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (A.1)–(A.6) hold with $r = 6$. Then*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_q} \left| \mathbf{P}_*\big(\mathbf{R}_n^* \in B\big) - \mathbf{P}\big(\mathbf{R}_n \in B\big) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Theorem 3.1 shows that after proper studentization, the modified perturbation bootstrap approximation of the distribution of the ALASSO estimator is second-order correct. The error rate reduces to $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ from $O(n^{-1/2})$, the best possible rate obtained by the oracle Normal approximation. This is a significant improvement from the perspective of inference. As a consequence, the precision of the percentile confidence intervals based on $\mathbf{R}_n^*$ will be greater than that of confidence intervals based on the oracle Normal approximation.

We point out that the error rate in Theorem 3.1 cannot be reduced to the optimal rate of $O_p(n^{-1})$, unlike in the fixed-dimension case. To achieve this optimal rate by our modified bootstrap method, we now consider a bias corrected pivot $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ and its modified perturbation bootstrap version $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$. The following theorem states that it achieves the optimal rate.

Theorem 3.2. *Let (A.1)–(A.6) hold with $r = 8$. Then*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_q} \left| \mathbf{P}_*\big(\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^* \in B\big) - \mathbf{P}\big(\check{\mathbf{R}}_n \in B\big) \right| = O_p(n^{-1})$$

Theorem 3.2 suggests that the modified perturbation bootstrap achieves notable improvement in the error rate over the oracle Normal approximation irrespective of the order of the bias term. Thus Theorem 3.2 establishes the perturbation bootstrap method as an effective method for approximating the distribution of the ALASSO estimator when $p \leq n$.

3.2 Results for $p > n$.

We now present a result for the quality of perturbation bootstrap approximation when the dimension p of the regression parameter can be much larger than the sample size n. We consider the initial estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ to be some $\sqrt{n}$-consistent bridge estimator, for example LASSO or Ridge estimator, in defining the ALASSO estimator by (1.2). The bootstrap version of LASSO or Ridge is defined by (2.2).

Theorem 3.3. *Let (A.1)(i), (ii), (iii)' and (A.2)–(A.6) and (A.7) hold with $r = 8$ and $b = 0$ and let $p > n$. Then*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_q} \left| \mathbf{P}_*\big(\mathbf{R}_n^* \in B\big) - \mathbf{P}\big(\mathbf{R}_n \in B\big) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_q} \left| \mathbf{P}_*\big(\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^* \in B\big) - \mathbf{P}\big(\check{\mathbf{R}}_n \in B\big) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Theorem 3.3 states that our proposed modified perturbation bootstrap approximation is second-order correct, even when $p > n$. Thus the error rate obtained by our proposed method is significantly better than $O(n^{-1/2})$, which is the best-attainable rate of the oracle Normal approximation. We want to point out that for the validity of our method, p can grow at at most a polynomial rate depending on the decay of the tail of the error distribution F and on the growth of the design vectors.

4 Impossibility of Second-order correctness of the naive perturbation bootstrap

In this section we describe the naive perturbation bootstrap as defined by MTC(11) for the ALASSO and show that second-order correctness can not be achievable by their naive perturbation bootstrap method. When the objective function is the usual least squares criterion function the naive perturbation bootstrap ALASSO estimator $\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N}$ is defined in MTC(11) as

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{v}_n^*} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{v}_n^*)^2 G_i^* + \lambda_n^* \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\tilde{\beta}_{j,n}^{*N}|^{-\gamma} |v_{j,n}^*| \right], \tag{4.1}$$

where

(i) $\lambda_n^* > 0$ is such that $\lambda_n^* n^{-1/2} \to 0$ and $\lambda_n^* \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.
(ii) the initial naive bootstrap estimator is defined as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{*N} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{v}_n^*} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i' \boldsymbol{v}_n^*)^2 G_i^* \Big]$$

and $\tilde{\beta}_{j,n}^{*N}$ is the jth component of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{*N}$.
(iii) $\{G_1^*, \ldots, G_n^*\}$ is a set of iid non-negative random quantities with mean and variance both equal to 1.

Note that the initial estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{*N}$ is unique only when p is less than or equal to n. We now consider the quantity $\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*N} = \sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)$, which we can show from (4.1) to be the minimizer

$$\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*N} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{w}_n^*} \left[\boldsymbol{w}_n^{*'} \boldsymbol{C}_n^* \boldsymbol{w}_n^* - 2 \boldsymbol{w}_n^* \boldsymbol{W}_n^* + \lambda_n^* \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\tilde{\beta}_{j,n}^{*N}|^{-\gamma} \Big(|\hat{\beta}_{j,n} + \frac{w_{j,n}^*}{\sqrt{n}}| - |\hat{\beta}_{j,n}| \Big) \right], \tag{4.2}$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{j,n}$ is the jth component of the ALASSO estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$, $\boldsymbol{C}_n^* = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{x}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i' G_i^*$, and $\boldsymbol{W}_n^* = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i G_i^*$. To describe the solution of MTC(11), assume

$\mathcal{A} = \{\beta_j \neq 0\} = \{1, \ldots, p_0\}$. MTC(11) claimed that when $\gamma = 1$ and p is fixed, $\big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n1}^{*N})', \boldsymbol{0}\big)'$ is a solution of (4.2) for sufficiently large n, where

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{n1}^{*N} = \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \epsilon_i \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)} (G_i^* - 1) \text{ and } ||\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*N} - \big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n1}^{*N})', \boldsymbol{0}\big)'||_\infty = o_{p_*}(1).$$

However, to achieve second order correctness, we need to obtain a solution $\big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N})', \boldsymbol{0}\big)'$ of (4.2) such that $||\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*N} - \big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N})', \boldsymbol{0}\big)'||_\infty = o_{p_*}(n^{-1/2})$. We show that such an $\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N}$ has the form

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N} = \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{*-1}\Big[\boldsymbol{W}_n^{*(1)} - \frac{\lambda_n^*}{\sqrt{n}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}_n^{*(1)}\Big]$$

for sufficiently large n, where $\boldsymbol{W}_n^{*(1)}$ is the first p_0 components of $\boldsymbol{W}_n^*$ and the jth component of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{s}}_n^{*(1)}$ equals to $\text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_{j,n})|\tilde{\beta}_{jn}^{*N}|^{-\gamma}$, $j \in \mathcal{A}$ (Here we drop the subscript n from the notations of true parameter values since we are considering p to be fixed in this section). We establish this fact by exploring the KKT condition corresponding to (4.2), which is given by

$$2\boldsymbol{C}_n^* \boldsymbol{w}_n^* - 2\boldsymbol{W}_n^* + \frac{\lambda_n^*}{\sqrt{n}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_n^* \boldsymbol{l}_n = \boldsymbol{0}, \tag{4.3}$$

for some $\boldsymbol{l}_n = (l_{1n}, \ldots, l_{pn})'$ with $l_{j,n} \in [-1, 1]$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_n^* = \text{diag}\big(|\tilde{\beta}_{1n}^{*N}|^{-\gamma}, \ldots, |\tilde{\beta}_{pn}^{*N}|^{-\gamma}\big)$. Since $\boldsymbol{C}_n^*$ is a non-negative definite matrix, (4.2) is a convex optimization problem; hence (4.3) is both necessary and sufficient in solving (4.2).

Note that $\boldsymbol{W}_n^*$ is not centered and hence we need to adjust the solution $\big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N})', \boldsymbol{0}\big)'$ for centering before investigating if the naive perturbation bootstrap can asymptotically correct the distribution of ALASSO up to second order. Clearly, the centering adjustment term is $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d}_n^* = \big(\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d}_n^{*(1)\prime}, \boldsymbol{0}'\big)'$ where $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d}_n^{*(1)} = \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{*-1} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)}$. It follows from the steps of the proofs of the results of Section 3 that we need $||\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d}_n^*|| = o_{p_*}(n^{-1/2})$ to achieve second-order correctness. We show that this is indeed not the case even in the fixed p setting.

More precisely, we negate the second-order correctness of the naive perturbation bootstrap of MTC(11) by first showing that $\big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N})', \boldsymbol{0}'\big)'$ satisfies the KKT condition (4.3) exactly with bootstrap probability converging to 1. Then we show that $\sqrt{n}||\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d}_n^*||$ diverges in bootstrap probability to ∞, which in turn implies that the conditional cdf of $\boldsymbol{F}_n^{*N} = \sqrt{n}\big(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n\big)$ can not approximate the cdf of $\boldsymbol{F}_n = \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n\big)$ with the uniform accuracy $O_p(n^{-1/2})$, needed for the validity of second-order correctness. We formalize these arguments in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose p be fixed and $\boldsymbol{C}_n \to \boldsymbol{C}$, a positive definite matrix. Define $Z_n^{*-1} = \sqrt{n}||\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{d}_n^*||$ and let $(\log n/n)^{1/2}.\max\{\lambda_n, \lambda_n^*\} \to 0$ and $\min\{\lambda_n, \lambda_n^*\}.(\log n)^{-(\gamma+1)/2}$*

$\to \infty$ *as* $n \to \infty$. *Also assume that (A.1)(i), (ii) and (A.4)(i) hold with* $r = 4$. *Then there exists a sequence of borel sets* $\{\boldsymbol{A}_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ *with* $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n \in \boldsymbol{A}_n) \to 1$ *and given* $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)' \in \boldsymbol{A}_n$, *the following conclusions hold.*

(a) $\mathbf{P}_*\Big(\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*N} = \big((\boldsymbol{u}_{n2}^{*N})', \mathbf{0}'\big)'\Big) = 1 - o(n^{-1/2})$.

(b) $\mathbf{P}_*\Big(Z_n^* > \epsilon\Big) = o(n^{-1/2})$ *for any* $\epsilon > 0$.

(c) $\sup\limits_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}^p} \Big|\mathbf{P}_*\big(\boldsymbol{F}_n^{*N} \leq \boldsymbol{x}\big) - \mathbf{P}\big(\boldsymbol{F}_n \leq \boldsymbol{x}\big)\Big| \geq K.\dfrac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}}$ *for some* $K > 0$.

Remark 2. Theorem 4.1 (a), (b) state that the naive perturbation bootstrap is incompetent in approximating the distribution of ALASSO up to second order. The fundamental reason behind second order incorrectness is the inadequate centering in the form of $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)$. Although the adjustment term necessary for centering is $o_{p_*}(1)$, which essentially helps to establish distributional consistency in MTC(11), the term is coarser than $n^{-1/2}$, leading to second order incorrectness. Part (c) conveys uniformly how far the naive bootstrap cdf is from the original cdf.

4.1 Motivation for the modified perturbation bootstrap

Theorem 4.1 settles the fact that naive perturbation bootstrap of MTC(11) does not provide a solution for approximating the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n)$. On an event with probability tending to 1, the naive perturbation bootstrap estimator suffers either in that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N}$ is not conditionally variable-selection consistent or $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n^{*N} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)$ is not $O_{p_*}(1)$. If one looks closely into the KKT conditions (4.3), one can recognize that the problem occurs because $\boldsymbol{W}_n^*$ is not centered. Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^*$ denote the centered version of $\boldsymbol{W}_n^*$, that is $\tilde{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^* = n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i(G_i^* - \mu_{G^*})$, and consider the vector equation

$$2\boldsymbol{C}_n^*\boldsymbol{w}_n^* - 2\tilde{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^* + \frac{\lambda_n^*}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_n^*\boldsymbol{l}_n = \mathbf{0}, \tag{4.4}$$

which is same as (4.3), but after replacing $\boldsymbol{W}_n^*$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^*$. Note that solutions to (4.4) are of the form $((\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*(1)})', \mathbf{0}')'$, where $\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*(1)} \neq 0$ is $p_0 \times 1$, are $O_{p_*}(1)$ on the set $\boldsymbol{A}_n$ as well as conditionally variable-selection consistent due to their form. If we consider the last $p - p_0$ equations of (4.3), after putting $((\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*(1)})', \mathbf{0}')'$ in place of $\boldsymbol{w}_n^*$, then for all $j = (p_0 + 1), \ldots, p$ we must have

$$-\frac{\lambda_n^*}{2\sqrt{n}}|\tilde{\beta}_{jn}^{*N}|^{-\gamma} \leq \Big[\big(\boldsymbol{C}_{21,n}^*\big)_{j\cdot}\boldsymbol{u}_n^{*(1)} - \tilde{W}_{jn}^*\Big] \leq \frac{\lambda_n^*}{2\sqrt{n}}|\tilde{\beta}_{jn}^{*N}|^{-\gamma}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $\left(\boldsymbol{C}^*_{21,n}\right)_{j.}$ is the jth row of $\boldsymbol{C}^*_{21,n}$. It can be shown easily that $[(\boldsymbol{C}^*_{21,n})_{j.}\boldsymbol{u}^*_{n1} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{W}}^{*(2)}_n]$ is $O_{p_*}(1)$, whereas on the set $\boldsymbol{A}_n$, under the hypothesis of Theorem 5.1(a) we have $||\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{*N}_n - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n|| = o_{p_*}\left(n^{-1/2}(\log n)^{1/2}\right)$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ being the ordinary least squares estimator (cf. Das and Lahiri (2016)). Since it is not in general guaranteed that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(2)}_n = \boldsymbol{0}$ on $\boldsymbol{A}_n$, (4.5) cannot be true; however, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(2)}_n = \boldsymbol{0}$ with high probability for sufficiently large n and hence if the bootstrap initial estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^*_n$ is close to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$, we can expect (4.5) to be satisfied. Thus we also need the centering modification for the perturbation bootstrap initial estimator, as mentioned in Section 2. We lastly note that $\boldsymbol{u}^{*(1)}_n$ involves the inverse of the random matrix $\boldsymbol{C}^*_{11,n}$. Though there is no problem in fixed dimension, the inversion of a random matrix can harm the approximation error rate in increasing dimension. However, if we implement the modification described in Section 2, then all of the above shortcomings of the perturbation bootstrap method become resolved and the conditional oracle property (**??**) will be satisfied even in increasing dimension under some mild regularity conditions.

5 Simulation results

We study through simulation the coverage of one-sided and two-sided 95% confidence intervals for individual nonzero regression coefficients constructed via the pivot quantities $\mathbf{R}_n$ and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ as well as via their modified perturbation bootstrap versions $\mathbf{R}^*_n$ and $\check{\mathbf{R}}^*_n$. To make futher comparisons, we also construct confidence intervals based on a Normal approximation to the distribution of a local quadratic approximation pivot $\mathbf{R}^{\mathrm{LQA}}_n$, which uses the estimator of $\mathrm{Cov}((\beta_j, j \in \hat{A}_n)')$ proposed in the original ALASSO paper by Zou (2006). We also consider the confidence interval based on the closeness in distribution of $\mathbf{T}_n$ to a $\mathrm{Normal}(0, \sigma^2\boldsymbol{D}^{(1)}\boldsymbol{C}^{-1}_{11,n}\boldsymbol{D}^{(1)})$ random variable, where we use the true active set of covariates $\mathcal{A}_n$ to compute $\boldsymbol{C}^{-1}_{11,n}$. We denote this by $\mathbf{R}^{\mathrm{oracle}}_n$. For comparison with another bootstrap procedure, we construct the confidence intervals based on the naive perturbation bootstrap from Minnier et al. (2011) which in that paper are denoted by CN^{*Q} and CN^{*N}.

Under the settings

$$(n, p, p_0) \in \{(120, 100, 4), (200, 80, 4), (150, 250, 6), (150, 500, 8)\},$$

we generate n independent copies $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$ of $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}$ from the model $Y = X'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon$, where ϵ is a standard normal random variable, $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_p)'$ is a mean-zero multivariate normal random vector such that

$$\mathrm{Cov}(X_j, X_k) = \mathbf{1}(j = k) + 0.3^{|j-k|}\mathbf{1}(j \le p_0)\mathbf{1}(k \le p_0)\mathbf{1}(j \ne k)$$

for $1 \le j, k \le p$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p)'$ with β_j defined as $\beta_j = (3/4)j(-1)^j\mathbf{1}(j \le p_0)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p$.

We compute the empirical coverage over 500 simulated data sets of one- and two-sided confidence intervals for each nonzero regression coefficient under crossvalidation-selected values of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n, where $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ is the value of the tuning parameter used to obtain the preliminary LASSO estimate $\tilde{\beta}_n$ and λ_n is the value of the tuning parameter used to obtain the ALASSO estimate $\hat{\beta}_n$.

In the $p \leq n$ setting, we set $\tilde{\lambda}_n = 0$, whereby we use the ordinary least squares estimate for the preliminary estimator $\tilde{\beta}_n$. When $p > n$, the value of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ is chosen via 10-fold crossvalidation and $\tilde{\beta}_n$ is computed under the selected value of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$. Once $\tilde{\beta}_n$ is obtained, 10-fold crossvalidation is used to select λ_n. The values $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n are thereafter held fixed for all bootstrap computations on the same dataset. In each crossvalidation procedure, the largest value of the tuning parameter for which the crossvalidation prediction error lies within one standard error of its minimum is used so that greater penalization is preferred. Tables 1 and 2 display the coverage results under crossvalidation selection of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n for the $n > p$ cases $(n, p, p_0) \in \{(120, 100, 4), (200, 80, 4)\}$ and Tables 3 and 4 for the $n < p$ cases $(n, p, p_0) \in \{(150, 250, 6), (150, 500, 8)\}$. The median values of the crossvalidation selections of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n under each setting are provided in the table captions in the forms $c_1 \cdot n^{1/2}$ and $c_2 \cdot n^{1/4}$ where c_1 and c_2 are constants. These correspond to the forms of the theoretical choices of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n under the choice of $\gamma = 1$.

In all simulations we use $\gamma = 1$ in the ALASSO and we set the number of bootstrap replicates to 1000. The perturbations $G_1^*, \ldots, G_n^*$ for the modified perturbation bootstrap are generated independently from the Beta$(1/2, 3/2)$ distribution and for the perturbation bootstrap of Minnier et al. (2011) from the unit-mean exponential distribution as prescribed in that paper.

In the $(n, p, p_0) = (120, 100, 4)$ case, for which Table 1 displays the results, the modified perturbation bootstrap intervals based on $\mathbf{R}_n^*$ and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ achieve the closest-to-nominal coverage, the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval performing somewhat better due to the bias correction. The two-sided $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval achieves sub-nominal coverage for the smallest regression coefficient $\beta_j = -0.75$, given that this coefficient was occasionally estimated to be zero, but achieves close-to-nominal coverage for the larger regression coefficients. The coverage of the other intervals is much more dramatically effected by the magnitude of the regression coefficient β_j, a phenomenon which is even more pronounced in the one-sided coverages; for example, the coverage of the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ interval rises from 0.37 for $\beta_1 = -0.75$ to 0.85 for $\beta_4 = 3.00$. Given that the modified perturbation bootstrap distributions of $\mathbf{R}_n^*$, and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ result in much closer-to-nominal coverages than the Normal approximations to the distributions of $\mathbf{R}_n$, and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$, we may conclude that the sample size is too small for the asymptotically-Normal pivots to have sufficiently approached their limiting distribution; the second-order correctness of the modified perturbation bootstrap is thus apparent.

Coverage and *(avg. width)* of two-sided 95% CIs: $(n, p, p_0) = (120, 100, 4)$

β_j	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\text{LQA}}$	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\text{oracle}}$	CN^{*Q}	CN^{*N}	$\mathbf{R}_n$	$\mathbf{R}_n^*$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$
-0.75	0.42	0.33	0.13	0.53	0.36	0.69	0.46	0.79
	(0.52)	*(0.37)*	*(0.44)*	*(0.47)*	*(1.15)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.53)*
1.50	0.53	0.49	0.21	0.76	0.52	0.90	0.61	0.92
	(0.48)	*(0.39)*	*(0.59)*	*(0.61)*	*(0.73)*	*(0.47)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.63)*
-2.25	0.74	0.70	0.43	0.86	0.72	0.89	0.78	0.93
	(0.50)	*(0.39)*	*(0.57)*	*(0.58)*	*(1.03)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.57)*
3.00	0.87	0.83	0.64	0.87	0.86	0.86	0.87	0.91
	(0.45)	*(0.37)*	*(0.49)*	*(0.49)*	*(0.50)*	*(0.37)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.48)*
Coverage of one-sided 95% CIs								
-0.75	0.33	0.25	0.10	0.41	0.27	0.71	0.37	0.83
1.50	0.45	0.42	0.16	0.66	0.44	0.91	0.53	0.95
-2.25	0.66	0.64	0.36	0.80	0.66	0.91	0.71	0.96
3.00	0.82	0.79	0.54	0.84	0.80	0.89	0.85	0.94

Table 1: Empirical coverage of 95% confidence intervals for nonzero regression coefficients over 500 simulations under $(n, p, p_0) = (120, 100, 4)$ using $\tilde{\lambda}_n = 0$ and crossvalidation choice of λ_n. The median λ_n choice was $0.79 \cdot n^{1/4}$. One-sided intervals are bounded in the $\text{sgn}(\beta_j)$ direction.

For the $(n, p, p_0) = (200, 80, 4)$ case, for which Table 2 displays the results, we see again that all the confidence intervals besides the $\mathbf{R}_n^*$ and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ intervals achieve sub-nominal coverage. Given the larger sample size, the coverage of $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ is close-to-nominal even for the smallest regression coefficient $\beta_1 = -0.75$. The bias correction of in the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval makes less of a difference in this case than in the $(n, p, p_0) = (120, 100, 4)$ case due to the larger sample size and smaller p. In spite of the larger sample size, however, the coverages of all the confidence intervals besides the modified perturbation bootstrap intervals are still dramatically affected by the size of the regression coefficient β_j, and none of them achieves close-to-nominal coverage for any of the nonzero regression coefficients.

In the $n < p$ settings, the modified perturbation bootstrap interval based on $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ continues to perform very well. Under the $(n, p, p_0) = (150, 250, 6)$ setting, for which Table 3 shows the results, the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval achieves the nominal coverage across all regression coefficients for both two- and one-sided intervals. The confidence intervals based on the asymptotic normality of the respective pivot all have sub-nominal coverage for most of the regression coefficients, and their coverages are dramatically affected by the magnitude of the true regression coefficient.

The results are similar for the $(n, p, p_0) = (150, 500, 8)$ case, for which Table 4 shows the results. The only confidence interval which reliably achieves the nominal coverage is the modified perturbation bootstrap interval based on $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$. We note that the width of the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval seems to adapt more to the magnitude of the regression coefficient than the widths of the Normal-based confidence intervals, which remain fairly constant across all magnitudes of β_j, resulting in poorer coverage for smaller regression coefficients. In contrast, the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval is able to

Coverage and *(avg. width)* of two-sided 95% CIs: $(n, p, p_0) = (200, 80, 4)$

β_j	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\mathrm{LQA}}$	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\mathrm{oracle}}$	CN^{*Q}	CN^{*N}	$\mathbf{R}_n$	$\mathbf{R}_n^*$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$
-0.75	0.39	0.35	0.12	0.67	0.36	0.88	0.45	0.91
	(0.39)	*(0.30)*	*(0.44)*	*(0.46)*	*(0.30)*	*(0.38)*	*(0.29)*	*(0.45)*
1.50	0.55	0.52	0.19	0.83	0.52	0.92	0.60	0.93
	(0.35)	*(0.31)*	*(0.52)*	*(0.53)*	*(0.31)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.30)*	*(0.47)*
-2.25	0.75	0.74	0.39	0.91	0.74	0.91	0.79	0.94
	(0.35)	*(0.31)*	*(0.47)*	*(0.47)*	*(0.31)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.30)*	*(0.39)*
3.00	0.89	0.89	0.64	0.93	0.89	0.91	0.90	0.91
	(0.32)	*(0.30)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.30)*	*(0.29)*	*(0.29)*	*(0.33)*
Coverage of one-sided 95% CIs								
-0.75	0.30	0.28	0.11	0.57	0.28	0.89	0.37	0.95
1.50	0.43	0.40	0.12	0.73	0.40	0.96	0.51	0.97
-2.25	0.65	0.64	0.31	0.82	0.64	0.94	0.71	0.95
3.00	0.82	0.81	0.53	0.86	0.81	0.92	0.84	0.95

Table 2: Empirical coverage of 95% confidence intervals for nonzero regression coefficients over 500 simulations under $(n, p, p_0) = (200, 80, 4)$ using $\tilde{\lambda}_n = 0$ and crossvalidation choice of λ_n. The median λ_n choice was $1.40 \cdot n^{1/4}$. One-sided intervals are bounded in the $\mathrm{sgn}(\beta_j)$ direction.

achieve nominal coverage even for the smallest values of β_j by producing suitably wider confidence intervals.

We see that the modified perturbation bootstrap is able to produce reliable confidence intervals for regression coefficients in the high-dimensional setting, and that it is able to do so under data-based selection of the tuning parameters. Further simulation studies may be found in the Supplementary Material.

6 Data analysis

To illustrate the construction of confidence intervals for regression coefficients in the high-dimensional linear regression model using the modified perturbation bootstrap, we present an analysis of the `riboflavin` data set considered in Bühlmann et al. (2014), which those authors make publicly available in their supplementary material. The data contains $n = 71$ independent records consisting of a response variable which is the logarithm of the riboflavin production rate and of 4088 gene expression levels in batches of *Bacillis subtilis* bacteria. Of the 4088, we pre-select 200 genes by sorting them in order of decreasing empirical variance and keeping the first 200. We then fit the linear regression model to the data set with $n = 71$ and $p = 200$ and compute confidence intervals for the regression coefficients selected by the ALASSO procedure. We choose $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n using 10-fold crossvalidation. Figure 1 displays the confidence intervals for the ALASSO-selected covariates obtained from the $\mathbf{R}_n^{\mathrm{LQA}}$, $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$, CN^{*N}, and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ pivots, 1000 bootstrap replicates were used for the bootstrap-based intervals.

The interval based on the $\mathbf{R}_n^{\mathrm{LQA}}$ pivot (straight line) and the CN^{*N} interval (jagged), are symmetric around the estimated value of the regression coefficient

Coverage and *(avg. width)* of two-sided 95% CIs: $(n, p, p_0) = (150, 250, 6)$

β_j	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\text{LQA}}$	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\text{oracle}}$	CN^{*Q}	CN^{*N}	$\mathbf{R}_n$	$\mathbf{R}_n^*$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$
-0.75	0.61	0.55	0.41	0.73	0.56	0.89	0.72	0.94
	(0.42)	*(0.32)*	*(0.44)*	*(0.47)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.56)*
1.50	0.72	0.69	0.52	0.86	0.70	0.93	0.85	0.95
	(0.42)	*(0.34)*	*(0.50)*	*(0.51)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.47)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.65)*
-2.25	0.90	0.88	0.72	0.91	0.88	0.92	0.92	0.95
	(0.43)	*(0.34)*	*(0.46)*	*(0.46)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.42)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.59)*
3.00	0.89	0.86	0.81	0.90	0.87	0.90	0.92	0.95
	(0.48)	*(0.34)*	*(0.42)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.53)*
-3.75	0.88	0.86	0.80	0.88	0.87	0.87	0.93	0.92
	(0.52)	*(0.34)*	*(0.40)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.37)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.50)*
4.50	0.91	0.88	0.85	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.94	0.95
	(0.49)	*(0.32)*	*(0.36)*	*(0.36)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.43)*
Coverage of one-sided 95% CIs								
-0.75	0.54	0.48	0.37	0.67	0.49	0.88	0.65	0.94
1.50	0.63	0.58	0.44	0.78	0.59	0.93	0.75	0.96
-2.25	0.85	0.82	0.65	0.88	0.83	0.94	0.89	0.95
3.00	0.85	0.83	0.74	0.87	0.84	0.91	0.89	0.94
-3.75	0.87	0.83	0.76	0.87	0.84	0.89	0.88	0.94
4.50	0.89	0.86	0.82	0.87	0.86	0.91	0.92	0.94

Table 3: Empirical coverage of 95% confidence intervals for nonzero regression coefficients over 500 simulations under $(n, p, p_0) = (150, 250, 6)$ using crossvalidation choices of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n. The median $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n choices were $0.01 \cdot n^{1/2}$ and $0.32 \cdot n^{1/4}$. One-sided intervals are bounded in the $\text{sgn}(\beta_j)$ direction.

(the CN^{*N} interval is formed by adding and substracting an upper quantile of a Normal distribution with a bootstrap-estimated variance). The intervals based on $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ is asymmetric owing to the bias correction (which is quite small in this example) and, in the case of the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval, owing to the bias correction and to the asymmetry of the bootstrap distribution of $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$. For some of the coefficients, the $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ interval is highly asymmetric, suggesting that the distribution of the pivot $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ may still be far from Normal.

7 Appendix

7.1 Additional Notations and Assumptions

We here introduce some additional notation required for stating our assumptions and useful for the proofs in the next subsection. For simplicity, we shall suppress the subscript n in the notations p_n and p_{0n}. Define

$$\boldsymbol{S}_n = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1} \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)'} . \sigma^2 & \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1} \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_n^{(1)} . \mu_3 \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_n^{(1)'} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1} \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)'} . \mu_3 & (\mu_4 - \sigma^4) \end{bmatrix},$$

Coverage and *(avg. width)* of two-sided 95% CIs: $(n, p, p_0) = (150, 500, 8)$

β_j	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\text{LQA}}$	$\mathbf{R}_n^{\text{oracle}}$	CN^{*Q}	CN^{*N}	$\mathbf{R}_n$	$\mathbf{R}_n^*$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$	$\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$
-0.75	0.68	0.54	0.42	0.81	0.56	0.86	0.77	0.94
	(0.53)	*(0.31)*	*(0.48)*	*(0.52)*	*(0.32)*	*(0.40)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.60)*
1.50	0.75	0.67	0.50	0.86	0.68	0.85	0.81	0.93
	(0.53)	*(0.32)*	*(0.51)*	*(0.52)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.42)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.65)*
-2.25	0.87	0.79	0.69	0.86	0.80	0.85	0.88	0.94
	(0.50)	*(0.32)*	*(0.46)*	*(0.47)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.38)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.59)*
3.00	0.89	0.82	0.76	0.86	0.83	0.86	0.92	0.94
	(0.49)	*(0.33)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.44)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.36)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.54)*
-3.75	0.89	0.83	0.79	0.86	0.84	0.87	0.92	0.94
	(0.48)	*(0.33)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.42)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.35)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.52)*
4.50	0.92	0.86	0.85	0.88	0.87	0.86	0.91	0.91
	(0.49)	*(0.33)*	*(0.40)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.44)*	*(0.51)*
-5.25	0.90	0.85	0.83	0.87	0.86	0.86	0.93	0.94
	(0.50)	*(0.32)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.39)*	*(0.33)*	*(0.34)*	*(0.43)*	*(0.50)*
6.00	0.94	0.89	0.88	0.90	0.90	0.88	0.93	0.93
	(0.48)	*(0.31)*	*(0.35)*	*(0.35)*	*(0.32)*	*(0.31)*	*(0.41)*	*(0.46)*
Coverage of one-sided 95% CIs								
-0.75	0.58	0.48	0.36	0.73	0.49	0.84	0.69	0.94
1.50	0.69	0.59	0.44	0.79	0.60	0.86	0.75	0.93
-2.25	0.81	0.73	0.61	0.80	0.74	0.85	0.83	0.93
3.00	0.86	0.79	0.70	0.83	0.80	0.85	0.86	0.94
-3.75	0.85	0.79	0.70	0.82	0.80	0.86	0.88	0.93
4.50	0.90	0.83	0.82	0.85	0.84	0.87	0.89	0.94
-5.25	0.87	0.84	0.80	0.85	0.84	0.87	0.90	0.94
6.00	0.90	0.85	0.83	0.86	0.85	0.87	0.91	0.94

Table 4: Empirical coverage of 95% confidence intervals for nonzero regression coefficients over 500 simulations under $(n, p, p_0) = (150, 500, 8)$ using crossvalidation choices of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n. The median $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ and λ_n choices were $0.01 \cdot n^{1/2}$ and $0.30 \cdot n^{1/4}$. One-sided intervals are bounded in the $\text{sgn}(\beta_j)$ direction.

where $\sigma^2 = \mathbf{Var}(\epsilon_1) = \mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1^2)$, and where μ_3 and μ_4 are, respectively, the third and fourth central moments of ϵ_1. Define in addition the $q \times p_0$ matrix $\check{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1/2}$ and the $p_0 \times 1$ vector $\check{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)}$.

Define, $\check{\boldsymbol{W}}_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \boldsymbol{x}_i$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^* = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i (G_i^* - \mu_{G^*})$. Write $\check{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{(0)} = \check{\boldsymbol{W}}_n$, $\check{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{*(0)} = \check{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^*$, $p^{(0)} = p$, $p^{(1)} = p_0$ and $p^{(2)} = p - p_0$. Define $\boldsymbol{b}_n = \sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1} \boldsymbol{s}_n^{(1)} \dfrac{\lambda_n}{2\sqrt{n}}$, where $\boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}$ are as defined earlier and $\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(1)}$ is a $p_0 \times 1$ vector with jth element $\text{sgn}(\beta_{jn}) |\beta_{jn}|^{-\gamma}$. Note that under the conditions (A.2)(i), (A.3) and (A.6)(i), $||\boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1/2}|| = O(1)$ and $||\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(1)}|| \leq K\sqrt{p_0}.n^{b\gamma}$, and hence $||\boldsymbol{b}_n|| = O(n^{-\delta_1})$. Also define $\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n$, $\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{(0)}$, and $\check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_n^{(0)}$, where $\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)} = \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)} = \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$; $\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i^{(0)}$ are as defined in Section 3 and $\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n = \check{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1} \check{\boldsymbol{s}}_n^{(1)} \dfrac{\lambda_n}{2\sqrt{n}}$, where $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}_n^{(1)} = (\check{s}_{1n}, \ldots, \check{s}_{p_0 n})'$ and $\check{s}_{jn} = sgn(\hat{\beta}_{jn}) |\hat{\beta}_{jn}|^{-\gamma}$.



Fig. 1: Confidence intervals based on $\mathbf{R}_n^{\mathrm{LQA}}$ (straight), $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n$ (wavy), CN^{*N} (jagged), and $\check{\mathbf{R}}_n^*$ (wiggly) for each of the ALASSO selected genes from the `riboflavin` data set.

We denote by $||\cdot||$ and $||\cdot||_\infty$, respectively, the L^2 and L^∞ norm. For a non-negative integral vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l)'$ and a function $f = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_l) : \mathscr{R}^l \to \mathscr{R}^l$, $l \geq 1$, write $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_l$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}! = \alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_l!$, $f^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (f_1^{\alpha_1}) \ldots (f_l^{\alpha_l})$, and $D^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} f_1 = D_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots D_l^{\alpha_l} f_1$, where $D_j f_1$ denotes the partial derivative of f_1 with respect to the jth component of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, $1 \leq j \leq l$. For $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \ldots t_l)' \in \mathscr{R}^l$ and α as above, define $t^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = t_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots t_l^{\alpha_l}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{V}}$ denote the multivariate Normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and dispersion matrix $\mathbf{V}$ having jth row $\boldsymbol{V}_{j\cdot}$ and let $\phi_{\mathbf{V}}$ denote the density of $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{V}}$. We write $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{V}} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}$ and $\phi_{\mathbf{V}} = \phi$ when $\mathbf{V}$ is the identity matrix.. Let K be a positive constant and r be a positive integer ≥ 3 unless otherwise specified. By $\mathbf{P}_*$ and $\mathbf{E}_*$ we denote, respectively, probability and expectation with respect to the distribution of G^* conditional upon the observed data.

We now introduce our assumptions.

(A.1) Let $\eta_{11,n}$ denote the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}$.
- (i) $\eta_{11,n} > Kn^{-a}$ for some $a \in [0, 1)$.
- (ii) $\max\{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n |x_{i,j}|^{2r} : 1 \leq j \leq p\} + \{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \left|(\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1})_{j\cdot}\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)}\right|^{2r} : 1 \leq j \leq p_0\} = O(1)$.
- (iii) $\max\{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n |\tilde{x}_{i,j}|^{2r} : 1 \leq j \leq p\} = O(1)$, where $\tilde{x}_{i,j}$ is the jth element of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i$. (when $p \leq n$)
- (iii)′ $\max\{c_{11,n}^{j,j} : 1 \leq j \leq p_0\} = O(1)$, where $c_{11,n}^{j,j}$ is the (j,j)th element of $C_{11,n}^{-1}$. (when $n < p$)

(A.2) There exists a $\delta \in (0,1)$ such that for all $n > \delta^{-1}$,

(i) $\sup\{\boldsymbol{x}'\check{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}\check{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)'}\boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{R}^q, ||\boldsymbol{x}|| = 1\} < \delta^{-1}$.

(ii) $n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n ||\check{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)}\check{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(1)}\check{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(1)'}\check{\boldsymbol{D}}_n^{(1)'}||^r = O(1)$

(iii) $\inf\{\boldsymbol{x}'\boldsymbol{S}_n\boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{R}^{q+1}, ||\boldsymbol{x}|| = 1\} > \delta$.

(A.3) $\max\{|\beta_{j,n}| : j \in \mathcal{A}_n\} = O(1)$ and $\min\{|\beta_{j,n}| : j \in \mathcal{A}_n\} \geq Kn^{-b}$ for some $b \geq 0$ such that $4b < 1$ and $a + 2b \leq 1$, where a is defined as in (A.1)(i).

(A.4) (i) $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^r < \infty$.

(ii) $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_1^2)$ satisfies Cramer's condition:
$\limsup_{||(t_1,t_2)||\to\infty} \mathbf{E}(exp(i(t_1\epsilon_1 + t_2\epsilon_1^2))) < 1$.

(A.5) (i) $\mathbf{E}_*(G_1^*)^r < \infty$. $\mathbf{Var}(G_1^*) = \sigma_{G^*}^2 = \mu_{G^*}^2$, $\mathbf{E}_*(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*})^3 = \mu_{G^*}^3$.

(ii) G_i^* and ϵ_i are independent for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

(iii) $((G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}), (G_1^* - \mu_{G^*})^2)$ satisfies Cramer's condition:
$\limsup_{||(t_1,t_2)||\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_*(exp(i(t_1(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}) + t_2(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*})^2))) < 1$

(A.6) There exists $\delta_1 \in (0,1)$ such that for all $n > \delta_1^{-1}$,

(i) $\dfrac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \delta_1^{-1} n^{-\delta_1} \min\Big\{\dfrac{n^{-b\gamma}}{p_0}, \dfrac{n^{-b\gamma - a/2}}{\sqrt{p_0}}\Big\}$.

(ii) $\dfrac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} n^{\gamma/2} \geq \delta_1 n^{\delta_1} p_0$

(iii) $p_0 = o\big(n^{1/2}(\log n)^{-3/2}\big)$.

(A.7) There exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ and $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$, δ_1 being defined in the assumption (A.6), such that

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\max\{\big|\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta}_{jn} - \beta_{jn})\big| : 1 \leq j \leq p\} > C.n^{\delta_2}\Big) = o(n^{-1/2})$$
$$\mathbf{P}_*\Big(\max\{\big|\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta}_{jn}^* - \hat{\beta}_{jn})\big| : 1 \leq j \leq p\} > C.n^{\delta_2}\Big) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Now we explain the assumptions briefly. Assumption (A.1) describes the regularity conditions needed on the growth of the design vectors. Assumption (A.1)(i) is a restriction on the smallest eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}$. Assumption (A.1)(i) is a weaker condition than assuming that $\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}$ converges to a positive definite matrix. (A.1)(ii) and (iii) are needed to bound the weighted sums of types $\big[\sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{x}_i\epsilon_i\big]$, $\big[\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\epsilon_i\big]$, $\big[\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(1)}\epsilon_i\big]$ (second one only when $p \leq n$). For $r = 2$ (A.1)(iii) is equivalent to the condition that the diagonal elements of the matrix $\boldsymbol{C}_n$ are uniformly bounded. Also for general value of r, (A.1)(ii) and (iii) are much weaker than conditioning on l_r-norms of the design vectors. Here the value of r is specified by the underlying Edgeworth expansion. Assumption (A.1)(iii) requires $p \leq n$ and hence is not defined when $p > n$. Note that the condition (A.1)(iii)$'$ needs $p_0 \leq n$ which is true in our setup due to assumption (A.6)(iii).

Assumptions (A.2)(i) bounds the eigenvalues of the matrix $\boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)}\boldsymbol{C}_{11,n}^{-1}\boldsymbol{D}_n^{(1)'}$ away from infinity. It is necessary to obtain bounds needed in the studentized setup. Assumption (A.2)(ii) is a condition similar to the conditions in (A.2)(ii)

and (iii); but involving the $q \times p$ matrix $\boldsymbol{D}_n$. This condition is needed for showing necessary closeness of the covariance matrix estimators $\breve{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n$ to $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$ (for details see Lemma 8.5).

Assumption (A.3) separates the relevant covariates from the non-relevant ones. The condition on the minimum is needed to ensure that the non-zero regression coefficients cannot converge to zero faster than the error rate, that is not faster than $O(n^{-1/2})$. We mention that one can assume $b < 1/2$ instead of assuming $b < 1/4$, but with the price of putting another restriction on the penalty parameter λ_n. We do not consider such a setting in this paper.

Assumption (A.4)(i) is a moment condition on the error term needed for valid Edgeworth expansion. Assumption (A.4)(ii) is Cramer's condition on the errors, which is very common in the literature of Edgeworth expansions; it is satisfied when the distribution of $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_1^2)$ has a non-degenerate component which is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure [cf. Hall (1992)]. Assumption (A.4)(ii) is only needed to get a valid Edgeworth expansion for the original ALASSO estimator in the studentized setup. Assumptions (A.5)(i) and (iii) are the analogous conditions that are needed on the perturbing random quantities to get a valid Edgeworth expansion in the bootstrap setting. Assumption (A.5)(ii) is natural, since the ϵ_i are present already in the data generating process, whereas G_i^* are introduced by the user. One immediate choice of the distribution of G^* is the Beta(α, β) distribution with $3\alpha = \beta = 3/2$. Also one can investigate the generalized beta family of distributions for more choices of the distribution of G^*.

Assumptions (A.6)(i) and (ii) can be compared with the condition (c) $\lambda_n/\sqrt{n} \to 0$ and $n^{\gamma/2}\lambda_n/\sqrt{n} \to \infty$ [cf. Zou (2006), Caner and Fan (2010)]. Whereas (c) is ensuring the oracle normal approximation, (A.6)(i) and (ii) are required for obtaining Edgeworth expansions. Lastly, (A.6)(iii) limits how quickly the number of non-zero regression coefficients may grow. Though it would seem that $p_0 = O(n)$ with $p_0 \leq n$ should be a sufficient restriction on the growth rate of p_0 for approximating the distribution of the ALASSO estimator, a careful analysis reveals that further reduction in the growth rate of p_0 is necessary for accommodating the studentization.

Assumption (A.7) places deviation bounds on both the sample and bootstrap initial estimators which are needed to get valid Edgeworth expansions. These conditions are satisfied by OLS estimator in $p \leq n$ case [cf. Lemma 7.2]. Note that Non-bootstrap part of (A.7) is satisfied if there exists a linear approximation of the type $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,j}\epsilon_i$ of $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta}_{j,n} - \beta_{j,n})$, where $\max\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^n |a_{i,j}|^r : 1 \leq j \leq p\Big\} = o\big(p^{-1}n^{-1/2+r\delta_2}\big)$ and $\mathbf{E}(|\epsilon_1|^r) < \infty$ for some $r \geq 3$. The bootstrap deviation bound corresponding to (A.7) holds provided similar approximation exits with $(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*})$ in place of ϵ_1. More precisely, for the ridge estimator and for its perturbation bootstrap version defined in Sec 2, if for some $r \geq 4$, the conditions

(a) $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^r + \mathbf{E}_*(G_1^*)^r < \infty$.

(b) $\max\{n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(|\boldsymbol{x}_i|^{2r}+|\breve{\boldsymbol{x}}_i|^{2r}) : 1\le j\le p\} = O(n^{\delta_2/2})$ for all $i\in\{1,\cdots,n\}$.
(c) $\max\big\{\boldsymbol{e}_j'(\boldsymbol{C}_n+\tilde{\lambda}_n n^{-1}\boldsymbol{I}_p)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_n : 1\le j\le p\big\} = O(n^{(1+\delta_2)/2}\tilde{\lambda}_n^{-1})$.
(d) $\sup\big\{\boldsymbol{e}_j'(\boldsymbol{C}_n+\tilde{\lambda}_n n^{-1}\boldsymbol{I}_p)^{-1}\boldsymbol{z}_n : ||\boldsymbol{z}_n||\le 1\big\} = O(n^{(1+\delta_2)/2}\tilde{\lambda}_n^{-1})$ for all $j\in\{1,\cdots,p\}$.

are satisfied, then the assumption (A.7) holds. Here $\breve{\boldsymbol{x}}_i=(\boldsymbol{C}_n+\tilde{\lambda}_n n^{-1}\boldsymbol{I}_p)^{-1}\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $\{\boldsymbol{e}_1,\cdots,\boldsymbol{e}_p\}$ is the standard basis of $\mathcal{R}^p$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ is the penalty parameter corresponding to the ridge estimator [cf. Sec 2]. This follows analogously to proposition 8.4 of Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013) after applying Lemma 7.1, stated below.

7.2 Proofs

Define, $\boldsymbol{A}_{1n}=\Big\{||\breve{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{(1)}||_\infty > K\sqrt{p_0 logn}\}\cap\{||\breve{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{(2)}||_\infty > K\sqrt{\log n}\}\cap||\{\sqrt{n}\big(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}-\boldsymbol{\beta}\big)||_\infty > K\sqrt{\log n}\Big\}$ for $p\le n$ and $\boldsymbol{A}_{1n}=\Big\{||\breve{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{(1)}||_\infty > K\sqrt{p_0\log n}\}\cap\{||\breve{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{(2)}||_\infty > K\sqrt{\log n}\}\cap\max\{\big|\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta}_{jn}-\beta_{jn})\big| : 1\le j\le p\} > C.n^{\delta_2}\Big\}$ for $p>n$.
Note that, $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{A}_{1n})\ge 1-O(p.n^{-(r-2)/2})$ for $p\le n$ and $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{A}_{1n})\ge 1-o(n^{-1/2})$ for $p>n$, by Lemma 8.1 of Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013).

Note that, $\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n=O_p(n^{-\delta_1})$, by Lemma 7.4 and 7.5, described below. Suppose, $r_1=\min\{a\in\mathcal{N} : ||\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n||^{a+1}=o_p(n^{-1/2})\}$, $\mathcal{N}$ being the set of natural numbers. Define the conditional Lebesgue density of two-term Edgeworth expansion of $\boldsymbol{R}_n^*$ as

$$\xi_n^*(\boldsymbol{x}) =\phi(\boldsymbol{x})\Bigg[1+\sum_{k=1}^{r_1}\frac{1}{k!}\Big\{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=k}\check{\boldsymbol{b}}_n^{\alpha}H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big\}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Bigg[-\frac{1}{2\hat{\sigma}_n^2}\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=1}\boldsymbol{t}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{*(3)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x})$$
$$+\frac{1}{6\hat{\sigma}_n^2}\Big\{\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=3}\boldsymbol{t}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{*(0)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x})-3\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=3}\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\zeta}|=2}\boldsymbol{t}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{\zeta}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{*(1)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{*(2)}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{\zeta}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big\}\Bigg]\Bigg],$$

where $x\in\mathcal{R}^q$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n^{(j)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})=n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(\check{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^{(0)}\hat{\epsilon}_i^j\Big)^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $j=0,1,\ldots$ and $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x})=(-D)^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\phi(\boldsymbol{x})$, where $\phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal density on $\mathcal{R}^q$.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose $Y_1,\ldots,Y_n$ are zero mean independent r.v.s and $\mathbf{E}(|Y_i|^t)<\infty$ for $i=1,\ldots,n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{E}(|Y_i|^t)=\sigma_t$; $S_n=\sum_{i=1}^{n}Y_i$. Then, for any $t\ge 2$ and $x>0$*

$$P[|S_n|>x]\le C[\sigma_t x^{-t}+exp(-x^2/\sigma_2)]$$

The above inequality was proved in Fuk and Nagaev (1971).

Lemma 7.2. *Under assumptions (A.1)–(A.3) and (A.4)(i),*

(i) $\mathbf{P}_*\big(||\breve{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{*(1)}||>K\sqrt{p_0\log n}\big)=O(p_0.n^{-(r-2)/2})$.
(ii) $\mathbf{P}_*\big(||\breve{\boldsymbol{W}}_n^{*(l)}||_\infty>K\sqrt{\log n}\big)=O(p^{(l)}.n^{-(r-2)/2})$, *for* $l=0,1,2$.

(iii) $\mathbf{P}_*\big(||\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^*_n - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)||_\infty > K\sqrt{\log n}\big) = O(p.n^{-(r-2)/2})$, *when* $p \leq n$.

The above lemma follows through the same line of Lemma 8.1 of Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013) and employing Lemma 8.1 stated above.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose p is fixed. Then under condition (A.1)(ii) and (A.4)(i) with r=2,*

$$\mathbf{P}_*\big(||\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{*N}_n - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}|| = o(1)\big) \geq 1 - o_p(1)$$

The above lemma is a weaker version of Proposition 1 of Das and Lahiri (2016).

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose assumptions (A.1)-(A.4) and (A.6) hold with $r = 4$. Then on the set $\boldsymbol{A}_{1n}$,*

$$||\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n||_\infty = O(n^{-1/2})$$

The above lemma follows from the form of ALASSO estimator and Theorem 8.2 (a) of Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013).

Lemma 7.5. *Under the assumptions (A.1)-(A.3), (A.4)(i) and (A.6)(i) and (iii) with $r = 6$, we have*

$$||\breve{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma_n||, ||\hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma_n|| = o_p(n^{-(1+\delta_1)/2})$$
$$||\tilde{\Sigma}_n - \sigma^2\Sigma_n||, ||\breve{\Sigma}_n - \sigma^2\Sigma_n|| = O_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where δ_1 is as defined in assumption (A.6).

The above lemma follows easily by using Lemma 7.1.

Lemma 7.6. *Let $p \leq n$ and suppose that (A.1)–(A.6) hold with $r = 6$. Then on a set A_{2n} with $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \boldsymbol{A}_{2n}) \to 1$, when $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \boldsymbol{A}_{2n}$, we have*

(a) if $p \leq n$, then

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_q} \Big|\mathbf{P}_*(\boldsymbol{R}^*_n \in B) - \int_B \xi^*_n(\boldsymbol{x})d\boldsymbol{x}\Big| = o(n^{-1/2}),$$

(b) if $p > n$, $b = 0$ and additionally conditions (A.7) and (A.1)(iii)$'$ (in place of (A.1)(iii)) hold, then

$$\sup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_q} \Big|\mathbf{P}_*(\boldsymbol{R}^*_n \in B) - \int_B \xi^*_n(\boldsymbol{x})d\boldsymbol{x}\Big| = o(n^{-1/2}).$$

The above lemma follows analogously to Theorem 8.2 (a) of Chatterjee and Lahiri (2013).

Proposition 2.1 follows easily and Theorems 3.1-3.3 follow as the corollary of Lemma 7.6.

Theorem 4.1 follows from the KKT condition and using corollary 2.6 of Bhattacharya and Rao (1986), the triangle inequality and the fact that $\lambda_n \to \infty$.

References

BHATTACHARYA, R. N. and GHOSH, J. K. (1978). On the validity of the formal Edgeworth expansion. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 434-451.

BHATTACHARYA, R. N. and RANGA RAO, R. (1986). *Normal approximation and asymptotic expansions*. John Wiley & Sons.

BOYD, S. and LIEVEN, V. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press.

BÜHLMANN, P., KALISCH, M. and MEIER, L. (2014). High-dimensional statistics with a view towards applications in biology. *Annual Review of Statistics and its Applications* **1**, 255-278

CAMPNOVO, L. (2015). On the validity of the pairs bootstrap for lasso estimators. *Biometrika* **102** 981-987.

CANER M. and FAN Q. (2010). "The Adaptive Lasso Method for Instrumental Variable Selection". Working Paper, North Carolina State University.

CHATTERJEE, S. and BOSE, A. (2005). Generalized bootstrap for estimating equations. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 414-436.

CHATTERJEE, A. and LAHIRI, S. N. (2010). Asymptotic properties of the residual bootstrap for Lasso estimators. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **138** 4497-4509.

CHATTERJEE, A. and LAHIRI, S. N. (2011). Bootstrapping lasso estimators. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **106** 608-625.

CHATTERJEE, A. and LAHIRI, S. N. (2013). Rates of convergence of the adaptive LASSO estimators to the oracle distribution and higher order refinements by the bootstrap. *Ann. Statist.* **41** 1232-1259.

DAS, D. and LAHIRI S. N. (2016). Second Order Correctness of Perturbation Bootstrap M-Estimator of Multiple Linear Regression Parameter. Preprint. Available at arXiv:1605.01440.

FAN, J. and LI, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **96** 1348-1360.

FUK, D. H. and NAGAEV, S. V. (1971). Probabilistic inequalities for sums of independent random variables. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.* **16** 660-675.

HALL, P. (1992). *The bootstrap and Edgeworth expansion*. Springer Series in Statistics.

HALL, P., LEE, Y. K., PARK, B. U. and Paul, D. (1992). Tie-respecting bootstrap methods for estimating distributions of sets and functions of eigenvalues. *Bernoulli* **15** 380-401.

JIN, Z. , YING, Z. and WEI, L. J. (2001). A simple resampling method by perturbing the minimand. *Biometrika*. **88** 381-390 .

KNIGHT, K. and FU, W. (2000). Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *Ann. Statist.* **28** 1356-1378.

MINNIER, J., TIAN, L. and CAI, T. (2011). A perturbation method for inference on regularized regression estimates. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **106** 1371-1382.

TIBSHIRANI, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* **58** 267-288.

TURNBULL, H. W. (1930). A Matrix Form of Taylor's Theorem. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* **33** 33-54.

VAN DE GEER, S., BÜHLMANN, P., RITOV, Y. and DEZEUR, R. (2014). On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *Ann. Statist.* **42** 1166-1202.

WANG, X. and SONG, L. (2011). Adaptive lasso variable selection for the accelerated failure models. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods* **40** 4372-4386.

ZHOU, Q. M., SONG, P. X.-K. and THOMPSON, M. E. (2006). Information ratio test for model misspecification in quasi-likelihood inference. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **107** 205-213.

ZOU. H. (2006). The Adaptive Lasso and Its Oracle Properties. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **101** 1418-1429.